Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/812,881	KOYAMA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Christian LaForgia	2439	

	Christian LaForgia	2439	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 03 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
 M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date 	of the final rejection		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth		
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	ED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor			
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo			
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a control NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reject	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment (I	OTOL -324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inpliant / inchanton (i	TOL OLT,
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected to			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:			

/Christian LaForgia/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2439 Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: It appears from page 7 of the Applicant's arguments that each of the plurality of processors has its own program block assigning means. The claim language has a wherein clause that states "wherein at least one of said plurality of processors comprises: program block assigning means." thereby leading the Examiner to conclude that only one processor has the program block assigning means. The applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are not rected the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F. 2d 1181, 26 USPAC2 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).